

REMARKS

Claims 6 and 10-26, as amended, remain herein. Claims 2 and 7-9 remain herein but are currently withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1 and 3-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 6 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. New claims 10-26 have been added based on the disclosure of the specification and thus contain no new matter.

1. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over either of Nakajima or Novosel. This rejection is moot, claim 1 having been cancelled, although its substance now appears in amended claim 6.

Neither Nakajima nor Novosel teaches novel and non-obvious elements of applicants' claimed fitting system kit comprising a fitting ball club and the data of FIG. 4, as now recited in independent claim 6. Neither of the cited references discloses the data of FIG. 4. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 6 and patentably distinguish over Nakajima and Novosel for at least the same reasons. Likewise, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Nakajima and Novosel, and claims 18-26 depend from claim 17 and patentably distinguish over Nakajima and Novosel for at least the same reasons and because the prior art does not teach the data set of claim 17.

For all the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Nakajima or Novosel of all elements of applicants' presently claimed invention. Similarly, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of those references which would suggest the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed

invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 1, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Flood.

Flood does not teach novel and non-obvious elements of applicants' claimed fitting system kit comprising a fitting ball club and the data of FIG. 4, as recited in independent claim 6. Flood does not disclose the data of FIG. 4. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 6 and patentably distinguish over Flood for at least the same reasons. Likewise, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Flood, and claims 18-26 depend from claim 17 and patentably distinguish over Flood for at least the same reasons and because the prior art does not teach the data set of claim 17.

For all the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in Flood of all elements of applicants' presently claimed invention. Similarly, there is no disclosure or teaching in Flood which would suggest the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Witherspoon.

This rejection is moot, both claims 1 and 3 having been cancelled, although the substance of claim 1 now appears in amended claim 6.

Witherspoon does not teach novel and non-obvious elements of applicants' claimed fitting system kit comprising a fitting ball club and the data of FIG. 4, as recited in independent

claim 6. Witherspoon does not disclose the data of FIG. 4. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 6 and patentably distinguish over Witherspoon for at least the same reasons. Likewise, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Witherspoon, and claims 18-26 depend from claim 17 and patentably distinguish over Witherspoon for at least the same reasons and because the prior art does not teach the data set of claim 17.

For all the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in Witherspoon of all elements of applicants' presently claimed invention. Similarly, there is no disclosure or teaching in Witherspoon which would suggest the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 1, 4, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yim.

The Office Action rejected claim 6, in part alleging that Yim discloses "a kit in the form of parts being separated (Fig. 5)." But Yim does not include any Fig. 5. Furthermore, Yim does not teach a fitting system kit, but instead discloses a golf putting stroke trainer with various components thereof shown separately for purposes of illustration only.

Yim does not teach novel and non-obvious elements of applicants' claimed fitting system kit comprising a fitting ball club and the data of FIG. 4, as recited in independent claim 6. Yim does not disclose the data of FIG. 4. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 6 and patentably distinguish over Yim for at least the same reasons. Likewise, claim 17 patentably distinguishes

over Yim, and claims 18-26 depend from claim 17 and patentably distinguish over Yim for at least the same reasons and because the prior art does not teach the data set of claim 17.

For all the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in Yim of all elements of applicants' presently claimed invention. Similarly, there is no disclosure or teaching in Yim which would suggest the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

5. Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Liotta.

Liotta does not teach novel and non-obvious elements of applicants' claimed fitting system kit comprising a fitting ball club and the data of FIG. 4, as recited in independent claim 6. Liotta does not disclose the data of FIG. 4. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 6 and patentably distinguish over Liotta for at least the same reasons. Likewise, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over Liotta. Claims 18-26 depend from claim 17 and patentably distinguish over Liotta for at least the same reasons and because the prior art does not teach the data set of claim 17.

For all the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in Liotta of all elements of applicants' presently claimed invention. Similarly, there is no disclosure or teaching in Liotta which would suggest the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/748,669

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

August 10, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Roger W. Parkhurst", written over a horizontal line.

Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177

RWP/ame

Attorney Docket No.: 28952.5629

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-6420